Comments on 'Stable Quantum Computation of Unstable Classical Chaos,' 'Efficient Quantum Computing Insensitive to Phase Errors,' and 'Quantum Computer Inverting Time Arrow for Macroscopic Systems'

Alec Maassen van den Brink*
D-Wave Systems Inc., 320-1985 West Broadway, Vancouver, BC, V6J 4Y3, Canada

(Dated: February 1, 2008)

arXiv:quant-ph/0112006v1 2 Dec 2001

Recently, a Letter [1] published by Georgeot and Shepelyansky has been criticized [4, 5]. The Letter claims an exponential speedup and reduction in error sensitivity, when phase-space density evolution under the Arnold cat map is performed on a quantum computer (QC). On the one hand, some points have not yet been made in [4, 5]. On the other, the authors' reaction [6] raises new issues. The present note addresses both.

The first point concerns stability of the classical and quantum algorithms under their respective "natural errors." By now, a consensus seems established that such comparison is fair only if both contestants operate on a discretized $N \times N$ map, say $N = 2^n$. Then, the quantum errors considered are unitary gate noise (amplitude errors), plus phase errors either in those gates or during storage. Classical errors are taken to be one-cell shifts. The problem here is not a fine point of QC theory, but a misconstruction of *classical* binary numbers. In fact, errors in all bits of a register are equally likely, and digital technology is based on getting all of them right most of the time, so that integers are processed error-free. This is what enabled the simulations in [1]. Thus, the classical algorithm has been deliberately handicapped.

Further, consider the evaluation of high harmonics of the evolved density, Fig. 1 in [6]. Like Fig. 1 in [1], obtained on a *simulated* QC, it offers a glimpse of a real one's wave function which nature does not allow one to see. Physically obtainable is a quantum measurement of the Fourier vector $\vec{k}$, yielding nontrivial information if the $\vec{k}$-density has strong peaks at high k. This is indeed the case for the cat map ([6], Fig. 1, bottom left and top right). Unfortunately, the latter's evolution closes in $\vec{k}$-space [6], and can be handled classically without effort. In contrast, the data shown (middle/bottom right) for a nontrivial "perturbed cat map" only have a slanted band of density—in all likelihood a mere transient due to the low number of iterations $t = 5$. The quantum approach now yields the gross features of this band. Fine structure, e.g. the small-amplitude low-k peaks for the original map, is much easier obtained classically. Thus, the implicit claim ([6], bottom of col. 1) of being in the same situation as Shor's algorithm (searching *one* period, verifiable a posteriori, of a spiked 1D k-space distribution) is valid only for a narrow set of questions, not substantiating the authors' original scope.

Given the chronology, it is remarkable that Refs. 4, 5 do not consider the follow-up [2]. The latter, cited in the authors' defence [6], boldly concludes that "the massive parallelism of QC is not necessarily related to quantum interference." Again, one is shown figures of inaccessible wave functions, involving a phase-space coarse-graining of which no benefit or application is given except that it can apparently be performed quickly on a QC. It is worthwhile to read the "more detailed discussion of measurements" in version 2 of [2]. The added penultimate paragraph, especially a casual remark in its last sentence, in fact refutes the whole paper and indeed its very title. An *in*coherent QC turns out to be an—expensive—classical one with random initial conditions, a basic point much in line with the remarks in [5].

The discussion of [3], also cited in [6], can be brief: the only research added is an extension of the map's y-axis, i.e., all the critiques [4, 5] apply. Note that the QC derives its memory capacity from superposition. Thus, the evolution of an ensemble of orbits is necessarily *linear*, corresponding to chaotic one-particle dynamics rather than to a classical gas with collisions. Hence, calling the problem "macroscopic" is an exaggeration, and Boltzmann is better left out of it.

In conclusion, the authors continue an unreasonably positive appraisal of their QC algorithm vis-a-vis the classical one. In particular, Ref. 2, instead of supporting the authors' case, is at fault in its basic premise and should be withdrawn.

I thank C.W.J. Beenakker, Yu.V. Gusev, P. Silvestrov, and A.M. Zagoskin for discussions.

---

* Electronic address: alec@dwavesys.com

[1] B. Georgeot and D.L. Shepelyansky, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 5393 (2001) (also quant-ph/0101004).
[2] B. Georgeot and D.L. Shepelyansky, to appear in *Electronic Correlations: from meso- to nano-physics*, edited by G. Montambaux and T. Martin, Rencontres de Moriond (2001) (also quant-ph/0102082).
[3] B. Georgeot and D.L. Shepelyansky, quant-ph/0105149.
[4] C. Zalka, quant-ph/0110019.
[5] L. Diósi, quant-ph/0110026.
[6] B. Georgeot and D.L. Shepelyansky, quant-ph/0110142.